CANNABIS CONTROL COMMISSION

**March 4, 2026**
**10:00 AM**

**In-Person at Cannabis Control Commission, Second Floor Public Meeting Room, Worcester Union Station, 2 Washington Square, Worcester and with Remote Access via Microsoft Teams Live***

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES

**Documents**:
- Application Materials associated with:
  - Staff Recommendations on Renewal Licenses
  - Staff Recommendations on Final Licenses
- Meeting Packet
- February 26, 2026, 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.000 Delivery Exclusivity and Secret Shopper Program Draft Regulations.
- February 26, 2026, 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 501.000 Secret Shopper Program Regulations Draft Regulations.

**In Attendance**:
- Chair Shannon O'Brien
- Commissioner Carrie Benedon
- Commissioner Kimberly Roy
- Commissioner Bruce Stebbins

**Minutes**:

I. Call to Order
- The Chair recognized a quorum and called the meeting to order.
- The Chair gave notice that the meeting is being recorded.
- The Chair gave an overview of the agenda.

II. Commissioners' Comments & Updates – 00:17:16
- Commissioner Roy expressed that she looked forward to conversations around receiverships and mentioned meetings around the Secret Shopper Program with stakeholders. She added that she also looked forward to conversations around Delivery Exclusivity and Secret Shopper. Commissioner Stebbins thanked Baked Beans Farm in Beverly for hosting him for a tour. He mentioned that he told them

about the EquityWorks Career Hub and connected them with the Equity Programming and Community Outreach (EPCO) department. He stated that Commissioner Roy and himself also visited Medicinal Genomics in Beverly. Commissioner Benedon made no comments. The Chair thanked staff and Associate General Counsel Erica Bruno (AGC Bruno).

III. Minutes – 00:20:40

- January 27, 2026
- Commissioner Roy moved to approve the January 27, 2026, Commission Public Meeting minutes.
- Commissioner Stebbins seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
  - Commissioner Benedon – Yes
  - Commissioner Roy – Yes
  - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
  - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the January 27, 2026, Commission Public Meeting minutes.

IV. Staff Recommendations on Renewal Licenses – 00:21:21

- Licensing Manager Tsuko Defoe (Manager Defoe) presented on behalf of the Licensing department the Staff Recommendations for Renewals and Final Licenses.

- Commissioner Roy moved to approve the renewal of items numbered 1 – 2 as indicated on the agenda.
- Commissioner Stebbins seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
  - Commissioner Benedon – Yes
  - Commissioner Roy – Yes
  - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
  - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the renewal of items numbered 1 – 2 as indicated on the agenda.

V. Staff Recommendations on Final Licenses – 00:24:15

1. W.S. Coliseum (#MR285088)

- The Chair thanked staff for their work on this License and appreciated the extra work for them to get through the process. Commissioner Stebbins stated he had to recuse himself and asked if he should leave the room. Commissioner Roy noted a discussion about rules of necessity. The Chair asked when the research on the rules of necessity would be completed and Executive Director (ED) Travis Ahern stated an update would be provided at the March 12th Public Meeting (PM). Commissioner Stebbins exited the room and Commissioner Roy thanked staff.

- Commissioner Roy moved to approve the Final License.
- Commissioner Benedon seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
  - Commissioner Benedon – Yes
  - Commissioner Roy – Yes
  - Commissioner Stebbins – Recused
  - Chair O’Brien – Yes
- The Commission passed the motion by a vote of three in favor and one recusal.

VI. Commission Discussion and Votes – 00:25:21

1. Change of Ownership Process
   - Commissioner Roy noted that the process had improved dramatically since the Commission started. She added they were seeing a lot of distressed Licensees and receiverships. She expressed that time was of the essence and jobs are on the line. She suggested removing red tape and still doing due diligence. She noted other jurisdictions can expediate the process much more quickly. She asked how they in light of the economic challenges and price compression, could they make it seamless. She stated she knows it is complex. The Chair asked how they get rid of some of the less important areas of enforcement so they can focus on public health and safety and protecting Consumers. Director of Licensing Olivia Koval (Director Koval) provided an overview of the Licensing department’s involvement in the Change of Ownership process and what they review when reviewing applications. She noted the ED does the approval of straight forward individual Change of Ownerships where they are not acquiring more than 10% of the company. She noted that the Licensing department gathers all of the documentation for due diligence. Director of Enforcement Training Armond Enos (Director Enos) stated that there have been instances where a current owner was undisclosed and they have to look at the buyer and seller to have everything be examined, and it takes time. The Chair asked about why they interview buyers and sellers. Director Enos stated that the interview happens after the Licensee had submitted the Change of Ownership control request and they want to make sure the documentation is still accurate. He added that there are ownerships that vary across Licensees. The Chair suggested streamlining the process. Director Enos expressed he wanted to reconvene with the Financial Investigation Team (FIT) managers for input. Director Koval noted that there have been questions in the past if it seems like there is a different type of review for Changes of Ownership compared to new applications and explained it. She added that the Department of Revenue (DOR) has questioned regarding are they allowing a Change of Ownership for someone who is not in good standing with DOR. Commissioner Roy added that they cannot be renewed if they are not in good standing. She asked if the FIT team was internal and Director Koval confirmed it was internal. Director Koval mentioned there were outliers in the data. Commissioner Stebbins asked the ED his thoughts in

terms of them being prepared for an onslaught next year. The ED stated they were comparing other jurisdictions processes where they are different from theirs. Commissioner Benedon asked about time and Director Koval explained the process once they get the documentation, do due diligence and get payment. Director Enos mentioned working with Citrin Cooperman to help with more complex ownership. The Chair mentioned streamlining the process to take the burden off the team and still have a fully complaint License and ownership. Commissioner Roy noted Information Technology (IT) limitations and mailing a check. The Chair asked the Chief Financial Accounting Officer Lisa Schlegel (CFAO Schlegel) if they could change to electronic payments and CFAO Schlegel stated the software did not allow that type of application. Director Koval added that they did put in a request with the third-party vendor that manages the Licensing software to see if they can get these applications online. The Chair asked how many Changes of Ownerships they process a year. The ED mentioned requesting two different IT platforms. Commissioner Roy proposed motion language and friendly amendments were suggested. Commissioner Benedon asked if there were internal Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) that Director Koval's team uses that would contain at least some of the info regarding the existing process and Director Koval confirmed. Commissioner Benedon asked if they could be shared with the Commissioners.

- Commissioner Roy moved to direct staff to conduct a comprehensive review of the Commission's current Change of Ownership (and Change of Control, where applicable) processes and requirements, including but not limited to the associated application forms, supporting documentation, review workflows, approval thresholds, and timelines. As part of this review, staff shall:
    1. Identify operational, legal, and policy bottlenecks that may contribute to unnecessary delay or administrative burden for applicants and the Commission.
    2. Evaluate processes and timelines for Change of Ownership in other jurisdictions with mature adult-use cannabis programs, including but not limited to states such as California (notice-based for partial changes), Arizona (notice model), and those with approval models like Colorado, New York, New Jersey, and Maryland; analyze key differences in approval/notice regimes, average processing times (e.g., weeks for notice states vs. months for pre-approval), statutory timelines where established, electronic submission usage, delegation authorities, and fee structures.
    3. Assess opportunities to streamline, standardize, or otherwise improve the efficiency, transparency, and predictability of the Change of Ownership process in Massachusetts, including benchmarking against peer states, potential adoption of notice filings for low-risk changes, mandated service level agreements (SLAs), and expanded use of existing electronic systems like MassCIP.
    4. Consider any needed regulatory, policy, or procedural changes, and evaluate potential impacts on public health and safety, equity goals, compliance, and

industry growth. Staff is further directed to return to the Commission within sixty (60) days with written recommendations.

- Commissioner Benedon seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
    - Commissioner Benedon – Yes
    - Commissioner Roy – Yes
    - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
    - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion.

2. Director of Testing and Compliance Hiring Process
    - The Chair stated that they need to make sure that the Director of Testing and Compliance would have the authority and ability to freely and openly talk about potential testing fraud independently to make scientific decisions around compliance. Commissioner Roy noted it as an issue in the past. The ED noted that the position would report to the Chief of Enforcement (CIE) and the CIE position was also under the recruitment process. The Chair noted concerns around preventing honest dialogue. Commissioner Roy noted the need to talk about it broadly to address issues. The ED noted the adjustments to the job description and that the position would be open until filled. He added that they had 49 applicants from March 3rd and phone screens were ongoing. The Chair asked who was conducting phone screens and the ED stated that Human Resources (HR) Generalist Soraya Pierre-Louis (HR Generalist Pierre-Louis) was. The Chair asked what the phone screen was for and how many they wanted to move forward to the next phase. The screening panel itself is assigned to Commissioner Roy, Enforcement Counsel Timothy Goodin (EC Goodin), Director Enos, and HR Generalist Pierre-Louis. Commissioner Roy asked who made the decision to move forward and he stated that the phone screen process would further clarify that. The Chair asked if Commissioner Roy had access to the resumes and he would set it up with Chief People Officer (CPO). The Chair asked for her to have access to that as quickly as possible. Commissioner Roy asked if she looked at the resumes and found someone to move forward could she do that and he said she could work with the CPO on that.

3. Launch of Licensee Outreach and Feedback
    - The Chair stated that she would be working with Director Enos to set up a regular meeting and that different Commissioners would be able to join in compliance with Open Meeting Law (OML). Position to train investigative staff and provide in the moment Licensee feedback. Allowing Licensees will reduce violations. Answers to questions to get into compliance and stay. Commissioner Roy asked if they would do a compliance tour and the Chair stated what she anticipated. She added that communication needed to be seamless and that the Chief Technology Information Officer (CTIO) was working to advance communication.

4. Review of Internal Processes for Receiverships

- Commissioner Roy thanked staff for putting collective heads together around receiverships and she flagged that the number of receiverships had gone up and would keep growing. She noted court appointed receiverships and that they have pre-approved appointees for receivership and increasing that list would help a distressed Licensee and charging fees. She identified two areas of red tape which disincentives to be preapproved by the Commission. EC Goodin stated it generally made sense and cited 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.104(3)(d)1. He added that the court has ultimate jurisdiction, but a cap issue is identified in statute. He also mentioned suitability. The Chair asked how they made it publicly available and put it on the website. EC Goodin flagged regulatory citations around receiverships and judicial invention. He cited 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.104(3)(c). EC Goodin recommended be careful to take any administrative enforcement action that may cross any line with any standing court orders. He stated he did not see any issue with posting the list and referred to the General Counsel (GC). He noted what his team looks at during the application process. He noted one consideration was practicality. The ED mentioned disclosures. Commissioner Stebbins stated the Commission has a renewal fee and the Commission does not get to keep it anyways. Commissioner Roy stated it has disincentivized people to go through this due to the fee. Director Koval noted the fee as an issue, and she has seen people turn away. Commissioner Stebbins noted keeping this in mind during their next regulatory round. Commissioner Roy read proposed motion language. The ED suggested to look into interim solutions.

- Commissioner Roy moved to direct staff as follows:
    1. Develop proposed regulatory amendments for the Red Tape Removal Working Group's review that would reduce or eliminate the pre-qualification fee for Preapproved Court Appointees and change the renewal schedule from annual to biennial. Further, direct the Executive Director and Chief Financial and Accounting Officer to consult with the Comptroller and/or State Auditor to determine whether the Commission has authority to waive or reduce the current $500 initial fee and $400 annual renewal fee cited in 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.104(3)(c).
    2. Develop and implement an outreach initiative to inform prospective qualified Preapproved Court Appointees of the benefits of Preapproved Court Appointee pre-qualification, with the goal of increasing the number available for court appointment. Once eight or more receivers are pre-qualified, staff shall publish the list on the Commission's website.
    3. Conduct outreach to the Massachusetts court system to provide guidance on how the statutory license cap and suitability applies to receivers and to inform the courts of the Commission's receiver pre-qualification process.
- Commissioner Stebbins seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
    - Commissioner Benedon – Yes
    - Commissioner Roy – Yes
    - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes

  - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion.

- The Chair noted that they received faulty advice regarding the authorization of the ED to unilaterally decide to change the final vote of the Commissioners from August of 2025. She shared that the ED relied on a motion that was made on September 10, 2020. She asked EC Goodin to provide for the board a review of the regulations and where the definition of minor exists. She asked to come back during the March 12th PM to see if those regulations were approved and not just draft. She noted in August of 2022 there was a memorandum from a former GC and the Chair discussing a legal case that basically stated it was illegal for Commissioners to delegate authority that requires judgment. She asked EC Goodin to find where the definition of minor is where the Commission has granted authority for the ED to make decisions that are minor in character that are normally should be retained to the Commission. She noted they would be having a broader discussion about delegation of authority and figuring out roles. Commissioner Roy asked EC Goodin if they were working on the form and he confirmed it would be circulated in about 30 days.

- Commissioner Roy moved to take a recess returning at 1:00 PM.
- Commissioner Benedon seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
  - Commissioner Benedon – Yes
  - Commissioner Roy – Yes
  - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
  - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion.
- The Commission took a brief recess. (Returned at 03:02:18.)

5. Discussion of Centralized Motion Tracker
   - The Chair tabled the discussion.

6. Update on Boston Bud Factory, Inc. Stipulated Agreement
   - EC Goodin asked the intent and the Chair stated the issue is understanding how certain investigations take years and some are done in shorter timeframe. She added that they did not have a Hearing Officer (HO) for two years and asked why no one brought that to the level of the Commission. EC Goodin stated that the GC appoints HOs and it is not an EC issue. He added that HOs are independent. She asked if they previously had internal staff that served as HOs on the Legal team and he confirmed. EC Goodin mentioned that processes are generally new in some areas as they had not gone through a full hearing process at the agency. He stated that in regulation it identifies that a HO will schedule a matter within a reasonable amount of time or a reasonable time. The Chair asked who defined reasonable and EC stated it was up to interpretation. The Chair noted that they rejected the Stipulated Agreement because they felt it was not strong enough. EC Goodin provided more clarity on the timeline

from the beginning and what prompted the enforcement action that was before the board on October 1, 2025. He also provided clarity around the investigation process. The Chair asked the role the GC played, and he provided her with clarity. EC Goodin stated that the process is influenced by the specific facts and circumstances that might be present in each case. The Chair expressed desire to tighten up the timeline and Commissioner Roy asked why it took six months for the respondent to request a hearing if in the regulation it was supposed to be done within 30 days. EC Goodin stated there was an informal dispute resolution conference request and they couldn't reach a resolution, so the hearing request was filed. Commissioner Roy stated that should automatically go to a more formal proceeding. EC Goodin explained that they send out a request form to see if there is an opportunity before getting before a HO. The Chair stated the board needs more transparency and too much authority is vested in the staff. She added they need to tighten up timelines. EC Goodin stated that their goal is always to have equal application for the regulations. EC Goodin provided a timeline of what had occurred since October 1, 2025. The Chair asked if they had the ability to negotiate the Stipulated Agreement. Commissioner Roy suggested putting conditions upon rejection. EC Goodin noted that since the board rejected the Stipulated agreement, that agreement is not in effect. EC Goodin added that they have to exhaust their administrative remedies and need to get a final agency determination. Commissioner Benedon stated she was uncomfortable waiving their right to go to a HO. EC Goodin stated that every matter needs to be handled on a case-by-case basis. The Chair mentioned thinking about an escrow fund that protected people of the Commonwealth. Commissioner Benedon pointed out that there is going to be some disparity in fines because part of the point of a fine is to assess a fine that's sufficient to deter future misconduct and is not just a cost of doing business for the Licensee. The Chair stated not any one person should have unilateral authority and it should rest with Commissioners. EC Goodin mentioned that every Stipulated Agreement, including a financial penalty, are all approved by the board.

- Commissioner Stebbins moved to take a recess returning at 2:05 PM.
- Commissioner Benedon seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
    - Commissioner Benedon – Yes
    - Commissioner Roy – Yes
    - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
    - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion.
- The Commission took a brief recess. (Returned at 04:05:57.)

7. Discussion and Review of Draft Regulations and Policy Questions
    - Associate General Counsel Erica Bruno (AGC Bruno) began at 935 Code Mass. Regs. §§ 500.050(10)(b) and 500.050(11)(f). She noted the two Commissioner decisions are whether to extend exclusivity and how long in length. The Chair expressed she was comfortable with three years with the ability to extend it. She

mentioned monitoring this on a regular basis and hopes to look into this again every year to assess. Commissioner Stebbins added that he was also comfortable with the three-year extension with the note they can extend more if they need too. He added that three years was also consistent with Social Consumption (SC) three-year exclusivity. Commissioner Roy echoed the comments and stated they could look at it anytime and that there was more to do. She mentioned the Social Equity Trust Fund (SETF) and noted that good things are in place and will be close to real time collecting data that we collected retrospectively last time. She also stated that Licensees may want an exit strategy at one point. Commissioner Benedon stated that she still advocated for more than three years and proposed five years. She explained that when Licensees accept trust fund money that includes a limitation on selling their assets or ownership stake in the business for a period of five years. She added that the issue of whether they were looking to provide additional period of time primarily for the benefit of existing Licensees. She expressed concern that three years without the certainty of a future extension simply wouldn't be enough time for new social equity operators or someone in the pipeline. Lastly, she stated she wanted to expand opportunities as much as possible for delivery. Commissioner Roy noted the resistance to opening and expanding the map and the Chair noted they do not want more applicants coming in because they will have to compete for the funds. Commissioner Benedon noted that they currently have 18 Provisional Licenses between Delivery Operators and Couriers and 26 in the application phase. Commissioner Roy asked Commissioner Benedon if she knew how long they were in the pipeline and she stated everyone at least is current within the year, but not sure when they started. Commissioner Benedon noted that testimony they heard was unanimously supporting five years and nothing shorter and noted the Donahue report. Commissioner Stebbins noted he would love for them during the intervening period to think about how they might support folks who have a Courier License moving to the Operator License. He added that after testimony, delivery market remains a challenge, and they need to continue to have those conversations to understand the challenges. He suggested talking to officials to say there is value in allowing delivery for both public health and public safety reasons. Commissioner Roy mentioned creating License types that expand access to medical.

- Commissioner Roy moved to adopt an extension for Delivery Exclusivity until April 1, 2029, with the ability of the Commission to affirmatively vote to extend such period, as determined by the Commission in its discretion.
- Commissioner Stebbins seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
    - Commissioner Benedon – No
    - Commissioner Roy – Yes
    - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
    - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission approved the motion by three in favor and one opposed.

- AGC Bruno stated that the next Commissioner decision was whether to include indigenous peoples to 935 Code Mass. Regs. §§ 500.050(10)(b)4. and 500.050(11)(f)4. The Chair noted it as appropriate to consider. Commissioner Stebbins stated this was raised at a Public Hearing and in comment and testimony. Commissioner Roy stated she was comfortable adding it. Commissioner Roy stated that the Massachusetts Supplier Diversity Office certifies business owned by Native Americans, indigenous people as a subcategory for minority business enterprise. AGC Bruno stated she was going to do some research and return to the board. AGC Bruno went to the definition of Secret Shopper and read. Commissioner Roy proposed expanding the definition and explained her proposed language. Commissioner Stebbins noted a concern about a secret shopper obtaining corresponding control samples of Marijuana or Marijuana products from Marijuana Product Manufacturers, Marijuana Cultivators for comparative or investigative purposes. Commissioner Roy noted they needed the ability to be able to contract with a third-party Licensee to obtain a sample and keep it in Metrc. Commissioner Benedon asked about the language that was added regarding under the age of 21 who is directed to pose as an individual 21 or older. AGC Bruno mentioned the Alcoholic Beverage Control Commission (ABCC) for their underage verification program and their standards. The Chair stated it is to see if they are even checking identification. AGC Bruno described what is being looked at in enforcement actions through the ABCC. She added that an under 21-year-old could misrepresent themselves, but they can't mispresent their age. She added that the ABCC has already set standards that have been up help in courts and that's an easy way for the Commission to adopt the program. Commissioner Roy asked Director Enos how when an investigator gets a product how does it get to the Independent Testing Lab (ITL) from the retailer. Director Enos stated the investigator would transport that utilizing the state vehicle and they have chain of custody documentation. Commissioner Roy asked if it stayed in Metrc and Director Enos confirmed. He added that it is anonymized so the ITL can not see where it came from. Commissioner Roy asked if a third-party transporter could obtain product and drive it to the ILT and Director Enos stated he would look into the question. The ED noted how other jurisdictions used employees or interns for their programs. AGC Bruno mentioned to the public that the amendments are mirrored in the Medical Use regulations except for the relevant citations. She went to 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.303(1) and read the proposed language. Commissioner Roy noted if they changed the Secret Shopper definition, they would want to make a change here and the ED confirmed. Commissioner Roy stated that purchase, procure, or obtain wouldn't box them in. Commissioner Stebbins asked if the title should be changed to "authorization" and AGC Bruno confirmed. She moved to 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.303(2) and Commissioner Stebbins proposed some changes to include authorization. Commissioner Benedon asked why it was documentation of authorizations rather than documentation purchases. Commissioner Stebbins stated it he changed it due to the retitling, and it was more than just purchases. AGC Bruno stated she could worth smith the language offline to include more than just purchases. Commissioner Roy noted interactions. The Chair noted consensus. AGC Bruno proceeded to 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.303(3) and proposed the changes. Commissioner Stebbins asked about flexibility to use a Marijuana Transporter including third-party transporters as well as the ITL to get product and take it back to their lab. Commissioner Roy noted anonymizing, so the lab doesn't know where the product came from. AGC Bruno proceeded to 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.303(4) and read the proposed language. Commissioner Roy noted that anywhere purchase is they should add procured and AGC Bruno agreed. The Chair suggested a break.

- Commissioner Roy moved to take a recess returning at 3:45 PM.
- Commissioner Stebbins seconded the motion.
- The Chair took a roll call vote:
  - Commissioner Benedon – Yes
  - Commissioner Roy – Yes
  - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
  - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion.
- The Commission took a brief recess. (Returned at 05:44:11.)

- AGC Bruno began at 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.303(5) and read. Commissioner Stebbins suggested under (c) to change authorization to participation. The Commissioners discussed authorization versus participation. Commissioner Stebbins stated he was ok with how it is. AGC Bruno stated she would wordsmith offline and consistency is helpful. Commissioner Roy proposed a title change to include both and the Chair noted consensus. AGC Bruno read 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.303(6) and proposed amendments and revisions. AGC Bruno moved on to 935 Code Mass. Regs. § 500.303(7) and read proposed amendments. Commissioner Stebbins suggested expanding. AGC Bruno stated there were two Commissioner decisions around as to the extent the secret shopper program is codified in regulation and whether to allow third parties to act as secret shoppers and the extent a secret shopper may act on behalf of the agency. The Chair noted consensus on it being regulated. Commissioner Roy shared the need for flexibility. Commissioner Benedon thanked Commissioner Roy for pushing the secret shopper program. AGC Bruno provided a timeline for the next meetings. Commissioner Stebbins asked if they were in a good position to make the deadline for exclusivity and AGC Bruno confirmed they were.

XII. New Business Not Anticipated at the Time of Posting – 06:06:50
- The Chair stated that there was no new business not anticipated at the time of posting.

XIII. Next Meeting Date – 06:06:58
- The Chair stated that the next meeting was scheduled for March 6, 2026.

VII. Adjournment – 06:07:27
- Commissioner Stebbins moved to adjourn.
- Commissioner Benedon seconded the motion.

- The Chair took a roll call vote:
    - Commissioner Benedon – Yes
    - Commissioner Roy – Yes
    - Commissioner Stebbins – Yes
    - Chair O'Brien – Yes
- The Commission unanimously approved the motion to adjourn.